REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claims 2, 9, 14, 16 and 17 are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1-13 and 15 are currently being amended.

Claims 18 and 19 are currently being added.

This amendment and reply adds, cancels and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After adding, canceling and amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-13, 15 and 18-19 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Non-Statutory Subject Matter:

In the Office Action, claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, the presently pending claims now recite a computer readable medium embodying a computer program, as well as recite a useful, concrete and tangible result ("routing of signaling messages based on routing information"). Accordingly, the presently pending claims are fully compliant with 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections – Indefiniteness:

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite, for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Office Action.

In reply, claim 1 now recites:

determining, by a signaling gateway process, routing information for enabling an application server process performed by an application server to identify a signalling gateway process to which to direct signalling messages destined for a particular point code on a network; and

making the information available to the application server process; and

directing the signaling messages for the particular point code by the application server performing the application server process based on the information,

wherein the information takes the form of a routing table that serves to distribute signalling gateway process identifiers over possible signalling link selector values included in signalling messages sent by the application server process.

Thus, a signaling gateway determines routing information for enabling another element, an application server that performs an application server process, to identify a signaling gateway process to which to direct signaling messages destined for a particular point code. Once that determination is complete, the information is made available to the application server (that performs the application server process), whereby the application server can now direct the signaling messages for the particular point code.

As such, presently pending independent claim 1 is not indefinite, and clearly recites steps used to direct signaling messages.

As to the term "particular point code", the use of points codes for such networks as SS7 is well known in the art, and thus "particular point code" is not believed to be indefinite.

As to claim 2, that claim recites things performed by the application server process, once it receives the information from the signaling gateway process. As such, it is not in conflict with the features recited in its base claim 1.

As to claim 8, it is clear from that claim that both the SLS values and the routing information received are used to direct the signaling.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by European Patent Application No. EP 1261217 to Roque. This rejection is traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

Claim 1 now recites:

determining, by the signaling gateway process, routing information for enabling an application server process performed by an application server to identify a signalling gateway process to which to direct signalling messages destined for a particular point code on a network; and

making said information available to the application server process; and

directing the signaling messages for the particular point code by the application server performing the application server process based on said information,

wherein the information takes the form of a routing table that serves to distribute signalling gateway process identifiers over possible signalling link selector values included in signalling messages sent by the application server process.

Thus, in claim 1, the signaling gateway process determines the routing information for enabling an application server process (that is performed by an application server) to identify a signaling gateway process to which to direct signaling messages destined for a particular point code on a network.

Also, as now recited in claim 1, the information takes the form of a routing table that serves to distribute signaling gateway process identifiers over possible signaling link selector values included in signaling messages sent by the application server process.

Turning now to the rejection of claim 2, whereby the features of that claim have been incorporated into claim 1, the Office Action asserts that paragraph 66 of Roque teaches these features. Applicants respectfully disagree. In detail, paragraph 66 of Roque describes that an SGP sends to all ASPs notifications related to availability events in the SGP, whereby this

sending out can be done by means of confirmed flow, so that the ASPs will answer back to the sending SGPO with a confirmation that they received the information. Nothing in paragraph 66 of Roque teaches or suggests that the information sent from the SGP takes the **form of a routing table** that serves to distribute signaling gateway process identifiers over possible signaling link selector values included in signaling messages sent by the application server process.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claim 1, as well as presently pending independent claim 8 that has been amended in a similar manner, are not anticipated by Roque.

Still further, with respect to dependent claim 4, that claim recites:

wherein the determined routing information is made available to the application server process in response to receipt of an audit message sent from the application server process to the signaling gateway process for a particular destination point code.

In its rejection of claim 4, the Office Action asserts that paragraphs 127, 128 and 157 of Roque teach the features of claim 4. Applicants respectfully disagree. Namely, in claim 4, an audit message is sent from the ASP to the SGP. In paragraphs 127 and 128 of Roque, a status notification is sent from the ASP to the SGP, whereby the status notification notifies of status content, and thus it does not correspond to the claimed audit message for a particular destination point code. Paragraph 157 of Roque describes that upon reception of an ADPAC and a further sending of ASPAC-ACK, the SGP sends to the connected ASP an SGP traffic maintenance message. Again, this does not correspond to the claimed audit message for a particular destination point code.

Accordingly, dependent claim 4, as well as dependent claim 11 that recites similar features, are not anticipated by Roque.

New Claims:

New claims 19 and 20 have been added to recite features described on pages 12-14 of the specification.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date _August 12, 2008_   By _Phillip J. Articola_

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY   William T. Ellis
Customer No.: 22879   Registration No. 26,874
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399   Phillip J. Articola
                                       Registration No. 38,819

-11-